UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/506,767	02/18/2000	Craig A. Link	MFCP.68211	8104

7590 09/11/2002

John Weresh
Shook Hardy & Bacon LLP
One Kansas City Place
1200 Main Street
Kansas City, MO 64105-2118

EXAMINER
CHARLES, DEBRA F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3629	

DATE MAILED: 09/11/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/506,767	Applicant(s) LINK ET AL.	
	Examiner Debra F. Charles	Art Unit 3629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *18 February 2000* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-29* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-29* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

Claims 1-29 have been reviewed.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 16 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner reads these claims as being much to broad since a computer-readable medium refers to many different things and these claims do not specifically indicate what items would be a part of the computer-executable instructions.

16. A computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the steps recited in claim 1.

23. A computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the steps recited in claim 17.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 3,4 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Swift et al. (US 5768519) and Broomhall et al. (US 6292904).

As per claim 1, Swift et al. disclose a method of producing a unique modified account name based on a requested account name that has been determined to already exist(Swift et al., Abstract, Fig. 5, Col. 9, Lines 40-67), the method comprising the steps of:

selecting a word element from a list of word elements(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 11, Lines 55-67, Col. 12, Lines 1-15);

combining the word element and the requested account name to produce a modified account name(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 11, Lines 1-30);

comparing the modified account name with a list of existing account names to determine whether the modified account name is unique(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 1-35); and

if the modified account name is unique(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 1-35), providing the modified account name to the user for acceptance(Broomhall et al., Abstract, Col. 3, Lines 30-67, Col. 4, Lines 1-22).

Swift et al. fails to disclose providing the modified account name to the user for acceptance.

Broomhall et al. disclose providing the modified account name to the user for acceptance(Broomhall et al., Abstract, Col. 3, Lines 30-67, Col. 4, Lines 1-22).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Swift et al. to provide the modified account name to the user for acceptance as taught by Broomhall et al. to ensure the user can affirm the data and give the system feedback on its accuracy and uniqueness.

As per claim 3 and 4, Swift et al. disclose a method as recited in claim 1.

Swift et al. fail to disclose wherein the word element is an adjective and wherein the word element is an affix.

Broomhall et al. disclose wherein the word element is an adjective and wherein the word element is an affix(Broomhall et al., Abstract, Col. 2, Lines 1-10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Swift et al. to use a word element that is an adjective and an affix or a prefix as taught by Broomhall et al. to ensure unique, unbiased account name because the computer is selecting word elements uniquely from a list and does not make a distinction between grammatical parts of speech from parts of speech from word elements since this varies with context in which the word appears. A word element on a word list is a word that is out of context and whether the word element is an adjective, affix, prefix, suffix, or noun would not affect the functionality of the invention.

As per claim 12, Swift et al. disclose a method as recited in claim 1, wherein if the modified account name is not unique, the steps for producing the unique modified account name are repeated for up to a predetermined number of iterations until a unique modified account name is produced(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 1-35).

5. Claims 2, 5,11,13 and 15, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Swift et al. and Broomhall et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and

further in view of Polnerow et al. (US 6292904).

As per claims 2 and 5, Swift et al. and Broomhall et al. disclose a method as recited in claim 1.

And further comprising the step of producing a second modified account name based on the requested account name that has been determined to already exist, the second modified account name being produced by(Swift et al., Abstract, Fig. 5, Col. 9, Lines 40-67):

combining the second selected word element with the requested account name to produce the second modified account name(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 11, Lines 1-30);

comparing the second modified account name with the list of existing account names to determine whether the second modified account name is unique(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 1-35); and

if the second modified account name is unique(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 1-35), providing the second modified account name to the user for acceptance(Broomhall et al., Abstract, Col. 3, Lines 30-67, Col. 4, Lines 1-22).

As per claim 15, Swift et al. and Broomhall et al. disclose a method as recited in claim 1, further comprising the steps of combining the requested account name with both an

underscore(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 15, Lines 55-67) and the randomly(Polnerow et al., Abstract, Col. 9, Lines 1-20) selected word element to produce a second modified account name if the first modified account name is not unique(Swift et al., Abstract, Fig. 5, Col. 9, Lines 40-67),

comparing the second modified account name with the list of existing account names to determine whether the second modified account name is unique(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 11, Lines 1-30), and

if the second modified account name is unique(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 1-35), providing the second modified account name to the user for acceptance(Broomhall et al., Abstract, Col. 3, Lines 30-67, Col. 4, Lines 1-22).

As applied to claims 2,5 and 15, Swift et al. and Broomhall et al. fail to disclose randomly selecting a second word element from the list of word elements.

Polnerow et al. disclose randomly selecting a second word element from the list of word elements(Polnerow et al., Abstract, Col. 9, Lines 1-20).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Swift et al. and Broomhall et al. to use a word element that is randomly selected from the list of word elements as taught by Polnerow et al. to ensure unique, unbiased account name.

Swift et al. fail to disclose providing the modified account name to the user for acceptance.

Broomhall et al. disclose providing the modified account name to the user for acceptance(Broomhall et al., Abstract, Col. 3, Lines 30-67, Col. 4, Lines 1-22).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Swift et al. to provide the modified account name to the user for acceptance as taught by Broomhall et al. to ensure the user can affirm the data and give the system feedback on its accuracy and uniqueness.

As per claim 11, Swift et al. and Broomhall et al. disclose a method as recited in claim 1, further comprising the steps of:

randomly(Polnerow et al., Abstract, Col. 9, Lines 1-20) selecting two further word elements and combining them to produce a random(Polnerow et al., Abstract, Col. 9, Lines 1-20) account name(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 11, Lines 55-67, Col. 12, Lines 1-15);

comparing the random(Polnerow et al., Abstract, Col. 9, Lines 1-20) account name with a list of existing account names to determine if the random(Polnerow et al., Abstract, Col. 9, Lines 1-20) account name is unique(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 1-35);

if the random(Polnerow et al., Abstract, Col. 9, Lines 1-20) account name is unique(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 1-35), providing the account name to a user for acceptance(Broomhall et al., Abstract, Col. 3, Lines 30-67, Col. 4, Lines 1-22).

Swift et al. fail to disclose random or randomly selecting two further word elements and combining them.

Polnerow et al. disclose random or randomly selecting two further word elements and combining them(Polnerow et al., Abstract, Col. 9, Lines 1-20).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Swift et al. and Broomhall et al. to use random or randomly selecting two further word elements and combining them as taught by Polnerow et al. to ensure unique, unbiased account name.

As per claim 13, Swift et al. and Polnerow et al. disclose a method as recited in claim 5. Swift et al. further disclose wherein if the second modified account name is not unique, the steps for producing the unique second modified account name are repeated for up to a predetermined number of iterations until a unique second modified account name is produced(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 1-35).

6. Claims 6, 7 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Swift et al. and Broomhall et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Ramasubramani et al. (US 6,233,577 B1).

As per claim 6, Swift et al. and Broomhall et al. disclose a method as recited in claim 1.

Swift et al. fail to disclose further comprising the step of producing a unique seeded(Ramasubramani et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 60-67) account name based on the requested account name(Swift et al., Abstract, Fig. 5, Col. 9, Lines 40-67), the unique seeded(Ramasubramani et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 60-67) account name being produced by:

combining the requested account name with a numerical seed(Ramasubramani et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 60-67) to produce a first seeded(Ramasubramani et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 60-67) account name(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 11, Lines 1-30);

comparing the first seeded(Ramasubramani et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 60-67) account name with the list of existing account names to determine whether the first seeded(Ramasubramani et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 60-67) account name is unique(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 1-35); and

if the first seeded(Ramasubramani et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 60-67) account name is unique(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 1-35), providing the first seeded(Ramasubramani et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 60-67) account name to the user for acceptance(Broomhall et al., Abstract, Col. 3, Lines 30-67, Col. 4, Lines 1-22).

As per claim 7, Swift et al. and Ramasubramani et al. disclose a method as recited in claim 6, wherein the seed(Ramasubramani et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 60-67) is a single digit number, the method further comprises the steps of

incrementing(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 1-50) the numerical seed(Ramasubramani et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 60-67) by one if the first seeded(Ramasubramani et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 60-67) account name is not unique,

combining the requested account name with the incremented(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 1-50) seed(Ramasubramani et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 60-67) to produce a second seeded(Ramasubramani et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 60-67) account name(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 11, Lines 1-30),

comparing the second seeded(Ramasubramani et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 60-67) account name with the list of existing account names to determine whether the second seeded(Ramasubramani et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 60-67) account name is unique(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 1-35), and

if the second seeded(Ramasubramani et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 60-67) account name is unique(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 1-35), providing the second seeded(Ramasubramani et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 60-67) account name to the user for acceptance(Broomhall et al., Abstract, Col. 3, Lines 30-67, Col. 4, Lines 1-22).

As per claim 14, Swift et al. and Ramasubramani et al. disclose a method as recited in claim 6, wherein if the first seeded(Ramasubramani et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 60-67) account name is not unique, the steps of producing the unique first seeded(Ramasubramani et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 60-67) account name are repeated for up to a predetermined number of iterations until a unique first

seeded(Ramasubramani et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 60-67) account name is produced(Swift et al., Abstract, Fig. 5, Col. 9, Lines 40-67).

As per claims 6, 7 and 14, Swift et al. and Broomhall et al. fail to disclose seed or seeded.

Ramasubramani et al. disclose seed or seeded (Ramasubramani et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 60-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Swift et al. and Broomhall et al. to use seed or seeded as taught by Ramasubramani et al. to get the benefit of using starter computer code to generate unique or random data items.

7. Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Swift et al. and Ramasubramani et al. as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of

Polnerow et al.

As per claims 8 and 9, Swift et al. and Ramasubramani et al. disclose a method as recited in claim 6.

And Swift et al. and Ramasubramani et al. disclose generating a second multi-digit numerical seed(Ramasubramani et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 60-67) if the first seeded(Ramasubramani et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 60-67)account name is not unique(Swift et al., Abstract, Fig. 5, Col. 9, Lines 40-67),

combining the requested account name with the second numerical seed(Ramasubramani et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 60-67) to produce a second seeded(Ramasubramani et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 60-67) account name(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 11, Lines 1-30),

comparing the second seeded(Ramasubramani et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 60-67) account name with the list of existing account names to determine whether the second seeded(Ramasubramani et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 60-67) account name is unique(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 1-35), and

if the second seeded(Ramasubramani et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 60-67) account name is unique(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 1-35), providing the second seeded(Ramasubramani et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 60-67) account name to the user for acceptance(Broomhall et al., Abstract, Col. 3, Lines 30-67, Col. 4, Lines 1-22).

Swift et al. and Ramasubramani et al. fail to disclose wherein a multi-digit number that is randomly generated.

Polnerow et al. disclose a multi-digit number that is randomly generated (Polnerow et al., Abstract, Col. 9, Lines 1-20).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Swift et al. and Ramasubramani et al. to a multi-digit number that is randomly generated as taught by Polnerow et al. to ensure unique, unbiased account names and related computer-generated numbers because computers routinely handle both multi-digit and single digit randomly generated numbers.

8. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Swift et

al. and Polnerow et al. as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of

Ramasubramani et al.

As per claim 10, Swift et al., Ramasubramani et al. and Polnerow et al. disclose a method as recited in claim 6. Swift et al. further disclose comprising the steps of combining the requested account name with both an underscore(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 15, Lines 55-67) and the numerical seed(Ramasubramani et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 60-67) to produce a second seeded(Ramasubramani et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 60-67) account name if the first seeded(Ramasubramani et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 60-67) account name is not unique(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 11, Lines 1-30),

comparing the second seeded(Ramasubramani et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 60-67) account name with the list of existing account names to determine whether the second seeded(Ramasubramani et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 60-67) account name is unique(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 1-35), and

if the second seeded(Ramasubramani et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 60-67) account name is unique(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 1-35), providing the second seeded(Ramasubramani et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 60-67) account name to the user for acceptance(Broomhall et al., Abstract, Col. 3, Lines 30-67, Col. 4, Lines 1-22).

Swift et al. fail to disclose seed or seeded.

Ramasubramani et al. disclose seed or seeded (Ramasubramani et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 60-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Swift et al. and Polnerow et al. to use seed

or seeded as taught by Ramasubramani et al. to get the benefit of using starter computer code to generate unique or random data items.

9. Claims 17-18 and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Swift et al., Broomhall et al. and Polnerow et al.

As per claim 17, Swift et al. disclose a method of producing a unique random(Polnerow et al., Abstract, Col. 9, Lines 1-20) account name in response to a request by a user(Swift et al., Abstract, Fig. 5, Col. 9, Lines 40-67), the method comprising the steps of :

selecting a first word element from a database including a list of word elements(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 9, Lines 40-67, Col. 11, Lines 55-67, Col. 12, Lines 1-15);

selecting a second word element from the database(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 9, Lines 40-67, Col. 11, Lines 55-67, Col. 12, Lines 1-15);

combining the first and second word elements to produce a random(Polnerow et al., Abstract, Col. 9, Lines 1-20) account name(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 11, Lines 1-30);

comparing the account name with a list of existing account names to determine if the account name is unique(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 1-35); and

if the account name is unique(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 1-35), providing the account name to the user for acceptance(Broomhall et al., Abstract, Col. 3, Lines 30-67, Col. 4, Lines 1-22).

As per claim 18, Swift et al. and Polnerow et al. disclose a method as recited in claim 17, wherein the first and second word elements are randomly(Polnerow et al., Abstract, Col. 9, Lines 1-20) selected from the database(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 9, Lines 40-67).

As per claim 20, Swift et al. and Polnerow et al. disclose a method as recited in claim 17, wherein if the random(Polnerow et al., Abstract, Col. 9, Lines 1-20) account name is not unique, the steps for producing the unique random(Polnerow et al., Abstract, Col. 9, Lines 1-20) account name are repeated for up to a predetermined number of iterations until a unique modified account name is produced(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 1-35).

As per claim 21, Swift et al. and Polnerow et al. disclose a method as recited in claim 20, wherein if the unique random(Polnerow et al., Abstract, Col. 9, Lines 1-20) account

name is produced in fewer than the predetermined number of iterations(Swift et al., Abstract, Fig. 5, Col. 9, Lines 40-67), the method further includes the steps of:

selecting further word elements from the database(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 9, Lines 40-67, Col. 11, Lines 55-67, Col. 12, Lines 1-15);

combining the further selected word elements to produce a further random(Polnerow et al., Abstract, Col. 9, Lines 1-20) account name(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 11, Lines 1-30);

comparing the further random(Polnerow et al., Abstract, Col. 9, Lines 1-20) account name with the list of existing account names to determine whether the further random(Polnerow et al., Abstract, Col. 9, Lines 1-20) account name is unique(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 1-35); and

if the further random(Polnerow et al., Abstract, Col. 9, Lines 1-20) account name is unique(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 1-35), providing the second modified account name to the user for acceptance(Broomhall et al., Abstract, Col. 3, Lines 30-67, Col. 4, Lines 1-22).

As per claim 22, Swift et al. and Polnerow et al. disclose a method as recited in claim 17, further comprising the steps of combining an underscore between the word elements to produce a second random(Polnerow et al., Abstract, Col. 9, Lines 1-20) account name if the first random(Polnerow et al., Abstract, Col. 9, Lines 1-20) account name is not unique(Swift et al., Abstract, Fig. 5, Col. 9, Lines 40-67),

comparing the second random(Polnerow et al., Abstract, Col. 9, Lines 1-20) account name with the list of existing account names to determine whether the second random(Polnerow et al., Abstract, Col. 9, Lines 1-20) account name is unique(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 1-35), and

if the second random(Polnerow et al., Abstract, Col. 9, Lines 1-20) account name is unique(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 1-35), providing the second random(Polnerow et al., Abstract, Col. 9, Lines 1-20) account name to the user for acceptance(Broomhall et al., Abstract, Col. 3, Lines 30-67, Col. 4, Lines 1-22).

As applied to claims 17-18 and 20-22, Swift et al. fail to disclose a random account name.

Polnerow et al. disclose a random account name (Polnerow et al., Abstract, Col. 9, Lines 1-20).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Swift et al. to use a random account name as taught by Polnerow et al. to ensure unique, unbiased account name.

10. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Swift et al. and Polnerow et al. as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of Broomhall et al.

As per claim 19, Swift et al. and Polnerow et al. disclose a method as recited in claim 17.

Swift et al. and Polnerow et al. fail to disclose wherein the first word element is an adjective and the second word element is a noun.

Broomhall et al. disclose wherein the first word element is an adjective and the second word element is a noun(Broomhall et al., Abstract, Col. 2, Lines 1-10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Swift et al. to use the first word element is an adjective and the second word element is a noun as taught by Broomhall et al. to ensure unique, unbiased account name because the computer is selecting word elements uniquely from a list and does not make a distinction between grammatical parts of speech from word elements since this varies with context in which the word appears. A word element on a word list is a word that is out of context and whether the word element is an adjective, affix, prefix, suffix, or noun would not affect the functionality of the invention.

11. Claims 24, 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Swift et al. and Broomhall et al.

As per claim 24, Swift et al. disclose a computer-readable medium having computer-executable components for producing a unique modified account name based on a requested account name that has been determined to already exist(Swift et al., Abstract, Fig. 5, Col. 9, Lines 40-67), comprising:

a user interface component for receiving an account name request(Broomhall et al., Abstract, Col. 3, Lines 30-67, Col. 4, Lines 1-22);

a database component including a list of word elements and a list of existing account names(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 9, Lines 40-67, Col. 11, Lines 55-67, Col. 12, Lines 1-15);

a name generating component for selecting word elements from the list of word elements and combining the word elements with the requested account name to produce modified account names(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 11, Lines 1-30); and

a search component for comparing the modified account names with a list of existing account names to determine whether the modified account names are unique(Swift et al., Abstract, Fig. 5, Col. 9, Lines 40-67) and,

if the modified account names are unique(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 1-35), providing the modified account names to the user for acceptance(Broomhall et al., Abstract, Col. 3, Lines 30-67, Col. 4, Lines 1-22).

Swift et al. fails to disclose a user interface component for receiving an account name request or providing the modified account names to the user for acceptance.

Broomhall et al. disclose a user interface component for receiving an account name request and providing the modified account names to the user for acceptance(Broomhall et al., Abstract, Col. 3, Lines 30-67, Col. 4, Lines 1-22).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Swift et al. to use a user interface component for receiving an account name request and providing the modified account names to the user for acceptance as taught by Broomhall et al. to provide feedback to the computer system on the accuracy and uniqueness of the account name.

As per claims 25 and 26, Swift et al. and Broomhall et al. disclose a computer-readable medium as recited in claim 24, wherein the word elements are affixes.

And Swift et al. and Broomhall et al. disclose a computer-readable medium as recited in claim 24, wherein the word elements are adjectives.

Swift et al. fail to disclose wherein the word elements are adjectives and wherein the word element are affixes.

Broomhall et al. disclose wherein the word element are adjectives and wherein the word element are affixes(Broomhall et al., Abstract, Col. 2, Lines 1-10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Swift et al. to use a word element that is are adjectives and wherein the word element are affixes as taught by Broomhall et al. to

ensure unique, unbiased account name because the computer is selecting word elements uniquely from a list and does not make a distinction between grammatical parts of speech from parts of speech from word elements since this varies with context in which the word appears. A word element on a word list is a word that is out of context and whether the word element is an adjective, affix, prefix, suffix, or noun would not affect the functionality of the invention.

12. Claims 27 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Swift et al. and Broomhall et al. as applied claim 24 in further view of Polnerow et al.

As per claim 27, Swift et al. and Broomhall et al. disclose a computer-readable medium as recited in claim 24, wherein the name generating component randomly(Polnerow et al., Abstract, Col. 9, Lines 1-20) selects the word elements from the list of word elements(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 11, Lines 55-67, Col. 12, Lines 1-15).

Swift et al. fail to disclose wherein the word element is randomly selected from the list of word elements.

Polnerow et al. disclose wherein the word element is randomly selected from the list of word elements(Polnerow et al., Abstract, Col. 9, Lines 1-20).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Swift et al. to use a word element that is randomly selected from the list of word elements as taught by Polnerow et al. to ensure unique, unbiased account name.

As per claim 29, Swift et al. and Broomhall et al. disclose a computer-readable medium as recited in claim 24, wherein the name generating component further produces a random(Polnerow et al., Abstract, Col. 9, Lines 1-20) account name by selecting two further word elements and combining them(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 11, Lines 1-30),

the search component comparing the random(Polnerow et al., Abstract, Col. 9, Lines 1-20) account name with the list of existing account names to determine whether the random(Polnerow et al., Abstract, Col. 9, Lines 1-20) account name is unique(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 1-35), and

if the random(Polnerow et al., Abstract, Col. 9, Lines 1-20) account name is unique(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 1-35), providing the random(Polnerow et al.,

Abstract, Col. 9, Lines 1-20) account name to the user for acceptance(Broomhall et al., Abstract, Col. 3, Lines 30-67, Col. 4, Lines 1-22).

Swift et al. and Broomhall et al. fail to disclose randomly selecting a second word element from the list of word elements.

Polnerow et al. disclose randomly selecting a second word element from the list of word elements(Polnerow et al., Abstract, Col. 9, Lines 1-20).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Swift et al. and Broomhall et al. to use a word element that is randomly selected from the list of word elements as taught by Polnerow et al. to ensure unique, unbiased account name.

Swift et al. fails to disclose providing the modified account name to the user for acceptance(Broomhall et al., Abstract, Col. 3, Lines 30-67, Col. 4, Lines 1-22).

Broomhall et al. disclose providing the modified account name to the user for acceptance(Broomhall et al., Abstract, Col. 3, Lines 30-67, Col. 4, Lines 1-22).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Swift et al. to provide the modified account name to the user for acceptance as taught by Broomhall et al. to ensure the user can affirm the data and give the system feedback on its accuracy and uniqueness.

13. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Swift et

al. and Broomhall et al. as applied claim 24 in further view of Ramasubramani et al.

As per claim 28, Swift et al. and Broomhall et al. disclose a computer-readable medium as recited in claim 24, wherein the name generating component further produces a seeded(Ramasubramani et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 60-67) account name based on the requested account name(Swift et al., Abstract, Fig. 5, Col. 9, Lines 40-67),

the seeded(Ramasubramani et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 60-67) account name being produced by combining the requested account name(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 11, Lines 1-30) with a numerical seed(Ramasubramani et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 60-67),

the search component comparing the seeded(Ramasubramani et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 60-67) account name with the list of existing account names to determine whether

the seeded(Ramasubramani et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 60-67) account name is unique(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 1-35), and

if the seeded(Ramasubramani et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 60-67) account names is unique(Swift et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 1-35), providing the seeded(Ramasubramani et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 60-67) account name to the user for acceptance(Broomhall et al., Abstract, Col. 3, Lines 30-67, Col. 4, Lines 1-22)(Broomhall et al., Abstract, Col. 3, Lines 30-67, Col. 4, Lines 1-22).

Swift et al. fails to disclose providing the modified account names to the user for acceptance(Broomhall et al., Abstract, Col. 3, Lines 30-67, Col. 4, Lines 1-22).

Broomhall et al. disclose providing the modified account names to the user for acceptance(Broomhall et al., Abstract, Col. 3, Lines 30-67, Col. 4, Lines 1-22) (Broomhall et al., Abstract, Col. 3, Lines 30-67, Col. 4, Lines 1-22).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Swift et al. to provide the modified account names to the user for acceptance as taught by Broomhall et al. to provide feedback to the computer system on the accuracy and uniqueness of the account name.

Swift et al. and Broomhall et al. fail to disclose seed or seeded.

Ramasubramani et al. disclose seed or seeded (Ramasubramani et al., Abstract, Col. 10, Lines 60-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Swift et al. and Broomhall et al. to use seed or seeded as taught by Ramasubramani et al. to get the benefit of using starter computer code to generate unique or random data items.

As per claims 6-10, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 27, and 29 official notice is taken that a seed or seeded value to generate numbers or words is an old and well-known type of display in the computer art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to implement Swift et al.'s invention with a seed or seeded value to generate numbers or words in order to get the benefit of using computer code to automatically generate numbers or words faster and more efficiently.

Conclusion

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Jalili et al., Remote Procedure Execution.

Miller et al., Method and System for Accessing A File Using File Names Having Different File Name Formats.

Klots et al., Methodology for Hosting Distributed Objects at A Predetermined Node in A Distributed System.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Debra F. Charles whose telephone number is (703) 305-4718. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-5 Monday thru Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss can be reached on (703) 308-2702. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-7687 for regular communications and (703) 305-7687 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

Debra F. Charles
Examiner
Art Unit 3629

dfc
September 6, 2002

JOHN G. WEISS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600